



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/732,024 | 12/08/2000 | Paula S. Newman | 001508-3190 | 1622 |

7590 07/09/2004
Gunnar G. Leinberg, Esq.
NIXON PEABODY LLP
Clinton Square, P. O. Box 31051
Rochester, NY 14603

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, THANH T

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|
|----------|--------------|

2144

DATE MAILED: 07/09/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/732,024

Applicant(s)

NEWMAN ET AL.

Examiner

Tammy T Nguyen

Art Unit

2144

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE (3) MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 December 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 12/8/00 are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

Detailed Office Action

1. This action is in response to the application 09/732,024 filed. **December 8, 2000.**
2. Claims **1-27** have been examined.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1, 3-5, 7-10, 12, 13, 15-18, 20, 21, and 23-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Mithras C. Maurille et al. (USPN 6,484,196 – Date of Patent: November 19, 2002, herein referred to as “Maurille”).

5. As to claim 1, Maurille teaches the invention as claimed, including a method for presenting email threads, comprising the steps of: identifying the logical components of each message in a thread (Fig.3B message in thread); determining the relationships between the messages in the thread using the logical components (col.3, lines 40-65); and generating a document based upon the determined relationships (col.10, lines 20-30).
6. As to claim 3, Maurille teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the step of identifying logical components comprises generating a message tree that includes nodes that recursively divide each of the messages into a main body, nested excerpts from other messages, and at least one subdivision wherein each subdivision is divided into lowest-level logical components (col.10, lines 35-45, and col.14, lines 15-60).
7. As to claim 4, Maurille teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the step of generating a message tree comprises: performing a top-down, recursive descent analysis to recursively divide each of the messages into sections, each section being one of a main-body of the message, an incorporated excerpt, a suffixed excerpt, the body of an excerpt, and an excerpt within all excerpt; and decomposing each section into logical components using a weighted finite-state machine (fig.4B, col.20, lines 15-55).
8. As to claim 5, Maurille teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the step of decomposing comprises: logically concatenating subsections of the body that is separated by incorporated excerpts; and applying a weighted finite state machine to the result (col.1, line 55 to col.2, line 10).
9. As to claim 7, Maurille teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the document includes a compressed form of each of the messages (Fig.7C compress email).

Art Unit: 2144

10. As to claim 8, Maurille teaches the invention as claimed, wherein each of the compressed forms comprises non-extraneous parts of the primary text and abbreviated forms of incorporated excerpts (col.4, lines 25-35).
11. As to claim 9, Maurille teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the document includes a replies as annotations form for each of the messages (col.14, lines 15-60).
12. As to claim 10, Maurille teaches the invention as claimed, including a computer controlled display system comprising: a display for presenting the e-mail threads on a viewing area of the display (Fig.3B message in thread); and a processor that is adapted to identify the logical components of each message in a thread (col.3, lines 40-65); determine the relationships between each message in the thread using the logical components, and generate a medium based upon the determined relationships (col.10, lines 20-30).
13. As to claim 12, Maurille teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the processor is adapted to generate a message tree that includes nodes that divide each message into a main body and into excerpts from other messages and further into lowest-level logical components (col.10, lines 35-45, and col.14, lines 15-60).
14. As to claim 13, Maurille teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the processor is adapted to perform a top-down, recursive descent analysis to create nodes of the message tree and to analyze divided extents using a weighted finite state machine (Fig. 4B, col.20, lines 15-55).
15. As to claim 15, Maurille teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the document includes a compressed form of each of the messages (Fig.7C compress email).

Art Unit: 2144

16. As to claim 16, Maurille teaches the invention as claimed, wherein each of the compressed form contains non-extraneous parts of the primary text (col.4, lines 25-35).
17. As to claim 17, Maurille teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the document includes a replies as annotations form for each of the messages (col.14, lines 15-30).
18. As to claim 18, Maurille teaches the invention as claimed, including an information storage media comprising: information that presents the e-mail threads on a viewing area of a display (Fig.3B message in thread); information that identifies logical components of each of the messages in the threads (col.3, lines 40-65); information that determines relationships between each of the messages in the thread using the logical components; and information that generates a medium based upon the determined relationships (col.10, lines 20-30).
19. As to claim 20, Maurille teaches the invention as claimed, further comprising information that generates a message tree that includes nodes that divide each message into a main body and into excerpts from other messages and further into lowest-level logical components (col.10, lines 35-45, and col.14, lines 15-60).
20. As to claim 21, Maurille teaches the invention as claimed, further comprising: information that performs a top-down, recursive descent analysis to create some nodes of the message tree (col.20, lines 15-55).
21. As to claim 23, Maurille teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the medium includes a compressed form of each of the messages (Fig.7C compress email).
22. As to claim 24, Maurille teaches the invention as claimed, wherein each of the compressed form contains non-extraneous parts of the primary text (col.4, lines 25-35).

Art Unit: 2144

23. As to claim 25, Maurille teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the medium includes a replies as annotations form for each of the messages (col.14, lines 15-60).
24. As to claim 26, Maurille teaches the invention as claimed, including a computer system for presenting email threads comprising a computer processor for: (a) identifying logical components of each message in a thread (Fig.3B message in thread); (b) determining relationships between the messages in the threads using the logical components (col.3, lines 40-65); and (c) generating a medium based upon the determined relationships, wherein the e-mail threads are presented in the medium as semi-connected text(col.10, lines 20-30).
25. As to claim 27, Maurille teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the medium is one of a human readable document and a computer readable document (Fig.2).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

26. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2144

27. Claims 2, 6, 11, 14, 19, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mithras C. Maurille., (hereinafter Maurille) U.S. Patent No. 6,484,196 in view of Costales et al., (hereinafter Costales) U.S. Patent No. 6,044,395.
28. As to claim 2, Maurille does not teach redundant logical components from the document. However, Costales teaches redundant logical components from the document (col.4, lines 10-25). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Maurille and Costales to have a redundant logical components from the document because it would have an efficient system that can provide to be used to guard the primary system from failure by acting as a back up system.
29. Claims 11, and 19 have similar limitations as claim 2; therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale.
30. As to claim 6, Maurille does not teach using a weighted finite state grammar and identifying the maximally weighted path through the network. However, Costales teaches using a weighted finite state grammar and identifying the maximally weighted path through the network (Fig.4, col.5, line 18 to col.6, line 60). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Maurille and Costales to have using a weighted finite state grammar and identifying the maximally weighted path through the network because it would have an efficient system that can provide the capability to efficiently transmit a large number of personalized e-mail message.

Art Unit: 2144

31. Claims 14, and 22 have similar limitations as claim 6; therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale.

Conclusion

32. Any inquiries concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Tammy T. Nguyen** who may be reached via telephone at **(703) 305-7982**. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday between 8:00 a.m. and 5:30 p.m. eastern standard time.

If you need to send the Examiner, a facsimile transmission regarding this instant application, please send it to **(703) 872-9306**. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's Supervisor, Bill Cuchlinski, may be reached at **(703) 308-3873**.

TTN

June 24, 2004

MARC D. THOMPSON
MARC THOMPSON
PRIMARY EXAMINER